

Citation for published version:

Rogers, J 2012, 'Anti-Oppressive Social Work Research: Reflections on Power in the Creation of Knowledge', *Social Work Education: The International Journal*, vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 866-879.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2011.602965>

DOI:

[10.1080/02615479.2011.602965](https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2011.602965)

Publication date:

2012

Document Version

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication](#)

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Anti-Oppressive Social Work Research: Reflections on Power in the Creation of Knowledge

Justin Rogers

This paper is based on the development of a framework that conceptualises forms of power in social work research. Its aim is to encourage readers to critically reflect on potentially oppressive manifestations of power in social work research. The article draws on Lukes' model of power and Gould's subsequent framework which contributed to anti-racist teaching in social work education. Gould's framework is reinterpreted and applied to a differing context: social work research. The field of social work research is explored through this framework, highlighting potentially oppressive manifestations of power and suggesting anti-oppressive strategies. The model is then applied to social work education and specifically the teaching of research methods. The paper concludes by suggesting curriculum guidelines that promote the teaching of anti-oppressive social work research methods.

Keywords: Social Work Research; Anti-Oppressive Research; Power; User-Led; Research Methods

Introduction

This paper consists of a critical discussion of oppression and power in research with a specific focus on the development of a heuristic framework for anti-oppressive social work research. The framework is based on Lukes' (1974, 2005) theories of power and it is adapted from Gould's (1994) work on anti-racist social work teaching; it is intended for use as a tool for critical reflection on the processes of power in research projects. The article concludes by proposing curriculum guidelines to highlight how the model could be applied in the teaching of social work research methods. The paper contributes to the discourse on anti-oppressive research (Strier, 2006; Potts and Brown, 2008) and it is intended for educators who are teaching research methods, students undertaking research projects and practitioners who critically engage with social work research evidence.

Correspondence to: Justin Rogers, School of Social and Policy Studies, University of Bath, Claverton Campus, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY, UK. Email: jmr32@bath.ac.uk

ISSN 0261-5479 print/1470-1227 online © 2012 Taylor & Francis
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2011.602965>

Anti-Oppressive Practice and Power

Anti-oppressive practice (AOP) is a concept that, at its core, is concerned with promoting values of equality and social justice by challenging the power of oppression (Dalrymple and Burke, 1995; Dominelli, 2003). AOP is a concept that remains central in both social work education and practice (Dalrymple and Burke, 1995; Thompson, 1999; Dominelli, 2003) and is listed within the aims and scope of *Social Work Education: The International Journal* (2010) whereby the journal seeks: 'Writings demonstrating and illustrating anti-oppressive approaches to training, education and practice'. In the most recent evaluation of the social work degree programme in England students were surveyed and found to report the highest levels of satisfaction with topics covering AOP and social work values and ethics (McNay, 2008), suggesting that students value the inclusion of AOP in their course curriculum. In the United Kingdom (UK) the concept is also evident in publications from the profession's governing bodies, including the General Social Care Council (GSCC), Care Council for Wales, and the Scottish Social Services Council. Skills for Care (2002) publish national occupational standards for social workers in England and they call for practitioners to take opportunities to form support groups using anti-oppressive frameworks. The values of anti-oppressive practice are also evident in the context of international social work. For example, the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) have published a definition of social work that refers to the following values of the profession:

Human rights and social justice serve as the motivation and justification for social work action. In solidarity with those who are dis-advantaged, the profession strives to alleviate poverty and to liberate vulnerable and oppressed people in order to promote social inclusion. (IFSW, 2002)

Despite AOPs' apparent prevalence in social work education and practice, Strier (2006) asserts that its liberating values are lacking in social work research, which often accepts the dominant research methodologies of the social sciences that rely on a researcher conducting research on 'subjects' who may have little involvement in the research. Strier (2006) goes on to highlight how these methodologies are not congruent with the AOP values that are central in social work as they do not have explicit anti-oppressive and empowering aims. He argues that social work should embrace anti-oppressive ways of conducting research and thus resist the dominant traditions upheld in social science research. However, Tew (2006) argues that AOP frameworks may be inadequate in identifying, addressing and/or tackling the different dimensions of power that may exist within a social situation. According to Potts and Brown (2008, p. 50), incorporating an understanding of power and AOP into research means that there is 'political purpose and action to your research [...] it is about paying attention to, and shifting, how power relations work in and through the processes of doing research'. This article addresses the gaps identified in the current literature about how to merge AOP with the rigour of social science research by providing a framework that, at its core, explicitly acknowledges power yet additionally aims to promote reflexivity into the complex nature of power in social work research.

The main argument of this article is not to advocate a new paradigm in social work research, as there already exists a considerable literature that demonstrates empowering, participatory and action-orientated methodologies in use in social work research (see Baldwin, 1997; Thomas and O’Kane, 1998; Healy, 2001); nor does this paper intend to paint a wholly pessimistic vision of rampant oppression in research, but rather, seeks to acknowledge and address the existence of anti-oppressive strategies in social work research. The framework (Table 1) aims to assist social work students in recognising the potential for power to manifest in research projects in oppressive forms in order to recognise and develop anti-oppressive alternatives.

Dominelli (2009, p. 251) argues that in an age of evidence-based practice it is important for social workers to become ‘research literate’. As with social work practice the research process can be understood as being a complex field with differing forms of power relationships that can perpetuate forms of oppression. The overall aim of this article is to merge the discourse between power, AOP and social science research by presenting a unique framework that collates the essential ingredients of antioppressive social work practice and social science research. The framework and the related proposals for curriculum guidelines are intended to encourage critical reflexivity on the processes of power in social work research.

Power has been conceptualised in various ways by many different theorist (Potts and Brown, 2008). The framework focuses specifically on the work of Lukes (1974, 2005), who first published *Power: A Radical View* over 30 years ago, a book which has been described as ‘seminal’ (Gould, 1994, p. 2) and ‘enormously influential’ (Dowding, 2006, p. 136). Lorenzi (2006, p. 87) highlights that the key strength of Lukes’ conceptualisation is its ability to enable its readers to begin to ‘think about power theoretically and how to study it empirically’. Lorenzi reinforces this point by describing how the clarity of Lukes’ typologies provides a framework to explore the complex dynamics of power. Gould’s subsequent framework highlights the potential for Lukes’ conceptualisation to be applied in practice; specifically to promote antiracist teaching in social work education.

Lukes’ (1974, 2005) conceptualisation identified three dimensions of power: (1) the behavioural view of power; (2) the non-decision making view of power; and (3) the hegemonic view of power. Gould (1994) subsequently used these dimensions of power to devise a framework to expose discriminatory practices and promote anti-racist teaching in social work. Gould also added a fourth dimension to Lukes’ theory, entitled the post-structuralist view of power. Gould suggested that this framework could be applied in different contexts to other forms of discrimination and oppression, which is realised in this paper by applying the model to oppression in social work research. The framework was developed based on the work by Lukes (1974, 2005) and Gould (1994); however, in applying their conceptualisations to social work research it offers a new perspective. The framework aims to expose the often covert power relations in research and this helps to build the central argument of the article, which calls for the extension of AOP in the social work curriculum to include the topic of anti-oppressive social work research.

Table 1 Framework for Anti-Oppressive Social Work Research [Developing the Construct of Gould (1994)]

Form of powerOppressive manifestationsAnti-oppressive strategies		
FirstmodalityBehaviouralview of power	Power exerted to influence decision making. Power in its most basic form, powerful are able to make the powerless do something they otherwise would not choose to do.	Research undertaken by academics on excluded and subjugated groups.
		Development of anti-oppressive policies by research funders and universities that recognises the need for service user involvement in social work research.
		Research governance with the effective ethical policies and procedures. Researcher's on-going critical reflection on power in their research proposals and projects.
SecondmodalityNon-decision making view of power	Commissioners and researchers maintain and control the research agenda.	Collaboration with service users to identify areas they want to be researched. Inclusion of sensitive topics.
		Research undertaken on practice, practitioners and organisations. Not just focusing on service users and pathologising their experience.
		Avoid 'tick box' consultation with service users.
ThirdmodalityHegemonic view of power	Strategic compromising. Tokenistic user consultation, ticking a box.	Aim for collaborative research, and where appropriate, user-led research.
	Service users consent too rarely are unaware of their oppressed status, and accept the power of the researchers and their 'expert' status.	Inclusion of service users when research is 'peer reviewed'.

(continued)

Table 1 – Continued

	FormsofpowerOppressivemanifestationsAnti-oppressivestrategies	
FourthmodalityPost-structuralistviewofpower		
Discursiveandbackgroundpractices thatreinforcepowerrelationships thatoftenenable oppression.	Discourses thatsupport powerrelationships between theresearcherandtheresearched.	Utiliseempoweringresearchmethodologies.
	Discursivepracticesand images thatreinforce the researcher as an expert.	Adoptactionorientatedresearchand participativeinquirywhereappropriate. Deconstructtextsandpractices thatpromote theresearcherastheexpert.

The four dimensions of the framework are discussed, as they relate to social work research, as follows.

The Behavioural View of Power

Lukes (2005, p. 16) describes the behavioural model of power as relating 'most closely to our common sense or intuitive understanding, namely that A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do'. This behavioural view is therefore an example of overt power, which is often evident in decision-making situations. This view of power is therefore the most visible of the three dimensions as Lukes argues that it is the power that the powerful want to be seen in order to reinforce their position. This form of power may be evident in social work research with studies undertaken on excluded and subjugated groups where the presumed 'expert' status of the researcher is reinforced. This could manifest itself with researchers not giving due consideration to ethical issues that ensure participants suffer no harm. This may include a researcher acting unethically by exerting his/her position of power and undertaking a study on service users without gaining their full informed consent to participate; for example, researcher A exerts his/her power to get participant B to take part in a project without fully informing the participant about the study or even respecting his/her right to withdraw consent. This form of behavioural power could also reinforce the expert position of the researcher who undertakes research on participants; this hierarchical relationship is potentially oppressive as it could lead to the research interests of service users being ignored as it treats them as subjects.

On a personal level, researchers could challenge overt forms of behavioural power by employing an anti-oppressive approach that involves on-going reflexivity throughout their projects. This reflexive approach would view ethical considerations in research as a process, rather than a form-filling exercise, at the start of a project. Viewing ethics as an on-going process enables researchers to gauge if participants are experiencing any harm or distress in the moment or in the future. On a structural level, oppressive manifestations of behavioural power may be lessened by commissioners and universities developing non-tokenistic policies and procedures that promote ethical and considered user-involvement.

In the UK the Department of Health (DOH) is an example of an organisation that holds structural power and it has published a research governance framework for health and social care. The framework provides national quality standards intended for implementation by the multiple stakeholders in health and social care research across the UK. The framework highlights a need for service user involvement and clearly states that 'relevant service users and carers or their representative groups should be involved wherever possible in the design, conduct, analysis and reporting of research' (DOH, 2005, p. 8).

The guidance also highlights the need to fully consider ethical issues when involving service users. For example, in the recent resource pack that supports the framework the following ethical issue is highlighted:

There may however be particular ethical issues involved in enabling access to service user and carer populations by untrained researchers, especially on research topics of a sensitive nature. It is therefore recommended that student research should not normally address these issues, unless a good case can be made. (DOH, 2010, p. 16)

Therefore, the research governance framework has clear implications for social work students' ability to undertake research that involves any kind of interaction with service users as this could be deemed to be too sensitive.

This is evident in UK social work education where a number of university undergraduate programmes restrict students' final year dissertation projects to literature reviews to avoid these ethical complexities. However, it could be argued that for a student's development it is important for them to engage in research with service users and that the potential harm to participants should be minimised with adequate training and supervision governed by rigorous and effective university ethical procedures. A fuller assessment of the impact of student research projects would be beneficial, in order to ascertain the potential value of involving service users in student research for the development of practice balanced with the potential harm they may experience.

The Non-Decision Making View of Power

This dimension of power recognises that there are many issues that are hidden or subjugated and that never enter the gaze of the public domain. It is a covert form of power that controls what gets decided, often by ignoring grievances that already exist. It is a form of power particularly relevant to research as, Lukes (1974, 2005) argues, it is a power exerted to control agendas; he refers to it as the 'mobilization of bias', and describes how it reinforces the position of the powerful by subjugating issues that threaten their position.

Dominelli (2009, p. 248) highlights the potential for this to occur in social work research as she states: 'social work researchers determine whose story counts as worthy of being told and decide which group of people will be subjected to the research gaze'. Dominelli goes on to acknowledge that wider structural and political institutions also influence the scope of the research gaze. For example, academic institutions, government departments and research councils are influential structural powers that shape social work research agendas. As commissioning bodies, the power of these institutions is often exercised through financial decision making and non-decision making, as they influence and decide which research students are worthy of receiving support and which research projects are worthy of funding.

Gould (1994, p. 9) describes how non-decision making forms of power can be produced unintentionally through 'habit or routine' as well as being an insidious and 'intentional exercise of power'. This highlights the importance of critical reflexivity in social work as oppression may occur unintentionally through routine practice. Wendt and Seymour (2010, p. 671) describe the importance of reflexivity in social work and state that 'if we fail to critique our practice then we neglect that we always have room

to improve at a personal and professional level'. Fook and Gardener (2007, p. 166) also reinforce the importance of this by encouraging practitioners to 'stand back from what is familiar and see it in new ways'.

The subjugation of research topics may also be intentional, for example, reluctance could exist with some researchers to study sensitive topics due to complex ethical issues that need detailed consideration, or some commissioners may be reluctant to fund controversial topics or projects likely to highlight the need for services and resources as this may threaten their position of power. A key oppressive manifestation of this form of non-decision making oppression is that commissioners and researchers often control the research agenda, which results in service users having no influence on the research, even though they are the people under its gaze.

The following points suggest ways to challenge oppressive non-decision making power in social work research: (1) orchestrate meaningful collaboration with service users to share the research agenda and identify topics important to them that they deem worthy of research; (2) ensure the inclusion of 'sensitive research', topics that may well be complex and challenging but of benefit to service users; and (3) conduct research that explores social workers' practice and organisations and exposes both strengths and limitations in service delivery, not just research on service users that potentially disempowers and pathologises their experiences. These points could be of particular importance for ethical committees to reflect upon when assessing antioppressive considerations in research proposals.

The Hegemonic View of Power

Lukes (1974, 2005) describes this as the third dimension of power and he relates it to Marxist ideologies whereby the historically held values and beliefs of disadvantaged groups mean they accept the status quo and subsequently see no worth in challenging it. In social work research this may be evident when researchers are viewed and accepted as trusted experts who are qualified to interpret and present the experiences of service users or service users accepting a disadvantaged status. Gould (1994, p. 10) describes this as the most 'potent form of power and can be that which pre-empts the possibility of conflict existing'. Lukes describes how hegemonic power averts conflict by shaping beliefs in an insidious and hidden way. He argues that this hidden form of power is the least accessible to observe and even when there appears to be an apparent consensus it is at work influencing people's wishes and thoughts. Lukes (2005, p. 64) states that hegemonic power has a way of inducing people to want things 'opposed to what would benefit them and to fail to want what they would, but for such power, recognize to be in their real interests'. He argues that 'we need to attend to those aspects of power that are least accessible to observation ... Power is at its most effective when least observable' (Lukes, 2005, p. 64). Exposing the hidden and insidious hegemonic forms of power is, in Lukes' view, challenging but also the most important aspect of power to study.

Gould (1994) describes how the hegemonic dimension of power leads to tactical concessions which result in cosmetic policies and reform in order to appease and maintain equilibrium. In social work research this could occur with tokenistic user involvement, whereby researchers tick a box to say they have involved service users but really fail to acknowledge or act on their views. This token involvement could also serve to divert the energies of the oppressed group from organising and resisting oppression themselves. Therefore hegemonic power could mean tactical and tokenistic concessions being made that serve to distract people from what is in their real interests. This form of power thereby induces them to settle for the accepted hegemony and the chosen research agenda of the researchers and commissioners.

A critically reflexive and anti-oppressive form of social work research could challenge hegemonic power and tactical concessions by embracing research approaches that are truly user-led. McLaughlin (2006) describes service user involvement in research as existing on a continuum and highlights the following three main characteristics. (1) Consultation—this is the process of asking people their views about the research. The major limitation in this approach is that there is no commitment to act upon these views. This approach can be deemed to be tokenistic and could represent Gould's (1994) notion of a tactical concession. (2) Collaboration—this approach involves the sharing of the project between the researcher and the researched. Service users become actively involved in the research design, the questions that are asked, and the analysis of the gathered data and the dissemination of the findings. (3) User-led—this is at the opposite end of the continuum to consultation; instead of the potential tokenistic practice of consulting with service users, the service users actually lead the research. This may still involve the skills of a professional researcher but the power relationship is fundamentally different as they are seen as accountable to the service users. This is not a new research paradigm and there is a growing literature on user-led research (Oliver, 1997). For example, Faulkner (2000) undertook a qualitative user-led study in the field of mental health, which involved interviews of 71 people. Every aspect of the study, from the interviews to the analysis of the data, was undertaken by service users with support from the researcher. The inclusion of service users at a structural level in organisations would also challenge hegemonic oppression, for example on research governance panels and as peer reviewers on research journals (see the Editorial Board membership of *Social Work Education: The International Journal*).

There are factors that need consideration when involving service users in research; for example, advocating involvement presupposes that service users want to be involved in research when all they may want is a service. The following comments from a service user who participated in research also highlight a potential pitfall of failing to properly respect people's contribution:

Academics don't appreciate the real costs of service user participation. They don't come to work for nothing, but sometimes it feels as though we should. I was asked to participate in some research—I would have been paid £5 for one hour's work but I would have spent 1.5 hours travelling. (GSCC, 2005, p. 37)

Such quotes highlight the need for projects that involve service users to be appropriately funded in order to suitably value their contribution.

The Post-Structuralist View of Power

Sarup (1993) describes how post-structuralist approaches to research signalled a paradigm shift from modernist thinking that attempted to explain the social world predominantly through positivist methods. Hughes and Sharrock (2007) describe this shift as the 'qualitative turn' where quantitative methodologies were no longer viewed as the pre-eminent form of research evidence. Wendt and Seymour (2010, p. 671) advocate the use of post-structuralist theory when teaching social work students, as they state that 'post-structural thinking encourages reflection on, and critique of theory and practice both for us as educators and students in social work'. Gould (1994) added the post-structuralist view of power to his framework in order to encourage reflexivity on discursive and background practices that impair anti-racist teaching. Gould described how a post-structural view of power acknowledges its shifting nature and recognises how it is influenced by cultural practices and dominant forms of knowledge or discourses.

Examining power in social work research through a post-structuralist lens enables potentially oppressive manifestations in discourses and background practices to be highlighted. These oppressive discourses and practices may privilege certain types of research evidence. For example, Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs) are dominant in health research; and have been referred to as providing the gold standard in evidence. The Department of Health (1999) have placed systematic reviews of RCTs at the top of a hierarchy of evidence. The Department of Health, who advocate the use of RCTs in research, also commission social care and social work research and their preference for RCTs suggests that they may privilege this form of quantitative research in their funding decisions. However this apparent 'gold standard' of evidence has its limitations; for example, Cheng (2006) refers to RCTs as the 'bronze standard' in evidence highlighting the problems of controlling the myriad of environmental and contextual factors that influence any intervention with humans. Research that uses this form of experimental design also runs the risk of reinforcing a researcher's position of power over their participants and in doing so frames them as experts in interpreting human experience.

This form of oppression can be challenged by recognising the need to develop a diverse body of research evidence in social work that does not just privilege RCTs as a gold standard, but also values research from differing ontological and epistemological positions. This may be achieved by utilising empowering participatory methodologies where the oppressive qualities of the 'researcher' and the 'researched' relationship is challenged; by working in partnership with emancipation and social justice being at the core of the endeavour. The user-led research facilitated by Faulkner (2000) is an example of how this can be achieved by involving service users at every stage of the process. The findings from that research were published and the paper has been cited both for its innovative anti-oppressive methodological approach and

importantly for the findings that highlighted important practice issues (Tait and Lester, 2005). It is also important to acknowledge that RCTs and user involvement are not mutually exclusive. For example, a recent review of the impact of service user involvement in health and social care research undertaken by Staley (2009) referred to examples of clinical trials that included service users in the design. Staley (2009, p. 12) argues that ‘... involvement was reported to be of particular value in clinical trials where it helped to improve trial design and ensured the use of relevant outcome measures’.

Applying the Framework: The Development of Curriculum Guidelines

It is anticipated that the framework (Table 1) could be used to directly facilitate an exercise that enables students, particularly postgraduate research students, to consider power and oppression when they are learning research methods, undertaking literature reviews and planning projects. The framework enables students to recognise encoded power relations in research projects in order for them to recognise alternative antioppressive approaches. Alongside this framework the following curriculum guidelines are presented that are intended to promote the teaching of anti-oppressive social work research in conjunction with the teaching of research techniques and methods.

Pawar (2010, p. 900) developed curriculum guidelines for teaching international social work and stated that it was not ‘appropriate to suggest overly-specific curriculum content to the social work schools and educators as countries’ contexts and interests are so diverse ... curriculum should be locally developed and contextualised’. The following curriculum guidelines are therefore offered as a starting point for educators to develop in a specific local context.

- (1) The meaningful involvement of service users in research. Developing the framework has led to reflection on different ways of developing anti-oppressive practice strategies to research for which the involvement of service users was a recurring theme. There is also an established literature that espouses the importance of this theme and calls for the involvement of service users in research (Hanley, 2005; McLaughlin, 2006). Therefore, it is argued that the involvement of service users in research should be included as a distinct topic in the social work curriculum. McLaughlin’s (2006) continuum of service user involvement is a useful tool to utilise to elicit discussions around this topic, in order to examine power relationships and AOP across the continuum, and explore strengths and limitations to each approach.
- (2) Power and the relationships. Potts and Brown (2008) describe how an antioppressive research approach is ‘all about power and relationships’. These are factors that run throughout these recommendations and they are also included here for consideration as a specific guideline. This article has demonstrated how theories of power, in particular the work of Lukes (1974, 2005) and Gould (1994), can be useful in exposing potentially oppressive practices in order to

suggest anti-oppressive strategies. The inclusion of theories of power in the social work research curriculum would also promote reflection on the relationship between a researcher and research participants. The works of Lukes (1974, 2005) and Foucault (1980) are useful resources to assist in discussions on this topic; this approach may also offer an opportunity to highlight how theory can be applied to social work research and practice.

- (3) Epistemological considerations. Social work research is carried out in diverse ways with a variety of methodological approaches that have differing epistemological underpinnings. Epistemological assumptions in research range from positivist quantitative studies to interpretative qualitative studies, as well as studies that employ participative and action-orientated methods. Examining and exposing the forces of power and potential manifestations of oppression across these differing approaches promotes thinking about anti-oppressive strategies. In the age of evidence-based practice (Sheldon, 2000), encouraging students to reflect on the question of 'what counts as evidence' will increase their research literacy (Dominelli, 2009) as well as enable them to consider anti-oppressive strategies for research processes.
- (4) Purpose. Anti-oppressive theory in social work promotes liberating and empowering values (Dalrymple and Burke, 1995; Dominelli, 2003). Few would argue against the need for social work research to share this liberating purpose. As Potts and Brown (2008, p. 50) state, 'given a simple choice between being an oppressive and anti-oppressive researcher, hopefully we would all choose the latter'. Butler and Drakeford (2005) describe social work as a social project that is concerned with social justice. It is argued here that social work research should share the same purpose as practice and should strive to be a social project with social justice at its core.

This proposed guideline argues that students would benefit from developing an understanding that some research approaches are more directly related to the values of social justice than others. For example, social work action research projects provide an example of a methodological approach to inquiry that has action and social justice at its heart (Baldwin, 1997). With other more dominant methodological approaches to research this aim is often less explicit (Strier, 2006). However it is also important to acknowledge that the more dominant methodological approaches may be better suited to explore certain research questions and areas of inquiry; in adopting these methods an anti-oppressive approach would involve developing strategies to ensure that empowering aims of social justice remain at the core of the research. As Potts and Brown (2008, p. 57) conclude, it is important to ask the following question of research: 'did the research matter? Did it leave participants better off?'.

Conclusion

This paper has discussed the relationships of power in social work research. It has explored the oppressive forces of power that subjugate people and privilege certain forms of knowledge, alongside forms of power that facilitate change and ultimately

empower the oppressed. The integrative framework (Table 1) is intended to encourage critical reflection on the processes of power in social work research. The framework has implications across social work disciplines in the areas of research, education and practice.

Social work education and practice exists in a domain of increasing professionalisation (Meagher and Parton, 2004). With the introduction of the degree programme, and the push for continuing professional development, social workers are now more than ever before required to engage with research findings and adopt evidence-based practice.

Social work researchers that wish to adopt an anti-oppressive approach can use the framework to consider the myriad of power relationships that influence a project. Dominelli (2003) argues that anti-oppressive practice involves a process of reflecting on power, listening to the oppressed and challenging oppression. This paper concludes that an effective way of achieving this with social work research would be to connect with people in a collaborative way, identifying issues as well as exposing oppression and joining with people to challenge it and instigate change.

This paper has clear implications for social work education and highlights a need for courses to not only cover methodological debates that centre on qualitative versus quantitative methods or the strengths and limitations of surveys, interviews or focus groups. In addition, social work curriculum must also include, encourage and champion the values of adopting an anti-oppressive approach to social work research.

References

- Baldwin, M. (1997) 'Day care on the move: learning from a participative action research project at a day centre for people with learning difficulties', *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 951–958.
- Butler, I. & Drakeford, M. (2005) 'Trusting in social work', *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 639–653.
- Cheng, H. Y. (2006) 'Randomized, controlled trials: gold or bronze?', *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, vol. 7, no. 9, pp. 611–612.
- Dalrymple, J. & Burke, B. (1995) *Anti Oppressive Practice Social Care and the Law*, Open University Press, Maidenhead.
- Department of Health (1999) *National Service Framework for Mental Health: Modern Standards and Service Models*, London.
- Department of Health (DOH) (2005) *The Research Governance Framework*. 2nd edn. Department of Health, London [online]. Available at: http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_4108962, accessed 23 May 2011.
- Department of Health (DOH) (2010) *The Research Governance Framework, Resource Pack for Social Care*, Department of Health, London [online]. Available at: http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_4108962, accessed 23 May 2011.
- Dominelli, L. (2003) *Anti-Oppressive Social Work Theory and Practice*, Palgrave, Aldershot.
- Dominelli, L. (2009) 'Social work research: contested knowledge for practice', in *Practising Social Work in a Complex World*, eds R. Adams, L. Dominelli & M. Payne, Palgrave, Basingstoke, pp. 240–255.

- Dowding, K. (2006) 'Three-dimensional power: a discussion of Steven Lukes' *Power: A Radical View*, *Political Studies Review*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 136–145.
- Faulkner, A. (2000) *Strategies for Living: A Report of User-Led Research into People's Strategies for Living with Mental Distress*, Mental Health Foundation, London.
- Fook, J. & Gardener, F. (2007) *Practising Critical Reflection*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge*, Pantheon, New York.
- General Social Care Council (GSCC) (2005) *Working Towards Full Participation* [online]. Available at: <http://www.gsccl.org.uk/cmsFiles/Education%20and%20Training/Working%20towards%20full%20participation%20report.pdf>, accessed 18 August 2011.
- Gould, N. (1994) 'Anti-racist social work: a framework for teaching and action', *Issues in Social Work Education*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 2–17.
- Hanley, B. (2005) *Research as Empowerment?*, Report of a series of seminars organised by the Toronto Group, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
- Healy, K. (2001) 'Participatory action research and social work: a critical appraisal', *International Social Work*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 93.
- Hughes, J. A. & Sharrock, W. W. (2007) *Theory and Methods in Sociology: An Introduction to Sociological Thinking and Practice*, Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) (2002) *Definition of Social Work* (in 16 Languages) [online]. Available at: <http://www.ifsw.org/f38000138.html>, accessed 23 May 2011.
- Lorenzi, M. (2006) 'Power: A Radical View by Steven Lukes', *The 3rd Millennium Journal of International Affairs*, pp. 87.
- Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View*. 1st edn. Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View*. 2nd edn. Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- McNay, M. (2008) *Evaluation of the new social work degree qualification in England* [online]. Available at: <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/kpi/scwru/pubs/2008/evaluationteammcnay2008evaluationexectu mm.pdf>, accessed 19 August 2011.
- McLaughlin, H. (2006) 'Involving young service users as co-researchers: possibilities, benefits and costs', *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 36, pp. 1395–1410.
- Meagher, G. & Parton, N. (2004) 'Modernising social work and the ethics of care', *Social Work and Society*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 10–27.
- Oliver, M. (1997) 'Emancipatory research: realistic goal or impossible dream', in *Doing Disability Research*, eds C. Barnes & G. Mercer, The Disability Press, Leeds, pp. 15–31.
- Pawar, M. (2010) 'Looking outwards: teaching international social work in Asia', *Social Work Education*, vol. 29, no. 8, pp. 896–909.
- Potts, K. & Brown, L. (2008) 'Becoming an anti-oppressive researcher', in *Rethinking Society in the 21st Century: Critical Readings in Sociology*, eds M. Webber & K. Bezanson, Canadian Scholars' Press, Toronto, pp. 50–57.
- Sarup, M. (1993) *An introductory guide to post structuralism and post modernism*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Harlow.
- Sheldon, B. (2000) *Evidence Based Practice*, Russell House, Lyme Regis.
- Skills for Care (2005) 'The national occupational standards for social work' [online]. Available at http://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/developing_skills/National_Occupational_Standards/social_work_NOS.aspx, accessed 18 August 2011.
- Staley, K. (2009) *Exploring Impact: Public involvement in the NHS, public health and social care research* [online]. National Institute for Health Research. Available at: <http://www.invo.org.uk/uk/viewnews.asp?valueid=457>, accessed 17 April 2011.

- Strier, R. (2006) 'Anti-oppressive research in social work a preliminary definition', *British journal of Social Work*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1908–1926.
- Tait, L. & Lester, H. (2005) 'Encouraging user involvement in mental health services', *Advanced Psychiatric Treatment*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 168–175.
- Tew, J. (2006) 'Understanding power and powerlessness', *Journal of Social Work*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 33–51.
- Thomas, N. & O'Kane, C. (1998) 'The ethics of participatory research with children', *Children & Society*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 336–348.
- Thompson, N. (1999) *Anti-discriminatory Practice*, Palgrave, Aldershot.
- Wendt, S. & Seymour, S. (2010) 'Applying post-structuralist ideas to empowerment: implications for social work education', *Social Work Education: The International Journal*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 670–682.